

THE "UNION" AND THE ELECTIONS.

The Official Organ at Washington becomes highly vindictive just about this time of the occurrence of those Whig victories and Democratic losses in the House of Representatives which change the complexion of the political majority of that body. It was to be expected, and was looked for with much more certainty than the realization of any of those passages in the almanacs foretelling snow about the first or fifteenth of January. Monday night it indulges all its bitterness under the head of "Coalition of Whig Leaders and Mexican Chiefs," and Tuesday evening it fairly raves through another column and a half, entitled "Madness of the Whigs." Well, the Whigs have become used to the denunciations of the Union, and at this time especially they will hardly be moved by them except to laughter. When a thief is pursued he endeavors to escape with the cry of "stop thief!" The Union has copied this device, and, knowing if there is an incident in all our Mexican relations which gives the slightest color to the charge of a coalition between any Mexican chief and any American politician it is the free passage into Mexico given by Mr. Polk to Santa Anna, he charges upon the Whigs this coalition as a diversion from this only evidence extant of any such union, combination, or affinity. As for the article headed "Madness of the Whigs," it is a very appropriate one for the Union at this time, only that the heading should be "Madness of the Union."

[Richmond Times.]

"THE OBSTACLES TO PEACE."

The Washington "Union" seems determined to persevere in the course of unparading detraction towards the Whig party which has marked its editorials since the adjournment of the last Congress, seemingly heedless, so its charges can be made "to tell," whether they are true or false. In a recent editorial, in which the Union proposes to exhibit the obstacles which prevent the conclusion of peace between the United States and Mexico, these words are used:

"At this very moment Mexico holds out the war exclusively on the arguments and pretences which the opposition orators and presses among ourselves have framed for her and instructed her to employ."

If there is any one press which has labored to produce this impression upon the Mexican mind, that press is undoubtedly the Washington Union, which raised the cry with the first inquiry into the President's proceedings, and which has ever since been giving it a most parrot-like repetition, until possibly it may have fallen a victim to its own delusion—which certainly happened upon no one else in this country. That the Mexicans may have been deluded into believing statements so gravely made by a journal professing to be the organ of the Nation, and whose feeble flippancy they were not aware of, may be true; and, if that impression is exclusively their reliance, the sin rests upon the head of the official organ, that produced it to their own paltry purposes of party.—*Savannah Republic.*

THE ENGLISH IN CHINA.

We have received by the Cambria the Hong Kong Overland Register of May 24, which contains more particulars of the state of affairs at Canton than were furnished us by the English newspapers.

The Emperor, it seems, acquiesced in the concessions made to the English by the Commissioner (Keying) upon the late expedition of Sir John Davis to Canton. It was feared that it might be otherwise; that, at least, according to the custom of the country, the Emperor might hold Keying responsible for the neglect of the Governor of the Bogue-forts in allowing them to be so completely unprepared for defence, and so might recall him and appoint another Commissioner from the party hostile to foreigners and advocates for war. The Emperor's answer to Keying is said to have been this in his own hand written letter: "The sheaf must be bent to the blast." The populace, however, appear to have abated none of their virulence or their contempt for foreigners. So far from it, their hatred seems to have been stimulated and increased by a singular sort of management on the part of the English. The Register states that the English troops were twice marched against the populace, and each time, after having assumed a threatening attitude, withdrawn in such a manner as to lead the Chinese to believe that they had driven them away. As a result of this management the Chinese were emboldened in their opposition to the English. The leaders of what are called the Patriots and Scholars were raising assessments of a month's rent upon all the houses in Canton, for the purpose of prosecuting a war with the English, and particularly for the purpose of attacking the Bogue-forts. The Emperor, however, has determined that the people manifested a chosen spirit of opposition to their building, and some of the boat-houses close upon houses occupied by foreigners had been set fire to and burnt. The native merchants had removed their families and valuables, fearing their own people more perhaps than others; for, in the event of a war, they might be plundered by the Patriots as well as by foreigners.

Meetings had been held at Honan, at which resolutions were passed against permitting the English to take possession of or build upon the newly ceded ground, and declaring that parties possessed of property would neither sell nor lease it to foreigners.—*Boston Traveller.*

There are probably few cities or large towns in the United States, in and near which do not exist precisely the same state of things as is described in the subjoined notice, from a Western paper. Offences of the same description, even down to the stealing of green corn, are frequent subject of complaint among the dwellers in the suburbs and borders of our own city:

FROM THE CINCINNATI GAZETTE OF AUGUST 18.

Complaints have been very frequent this season of injuries sustained to the private property of our citizens, which are very grievous, and wherein the perpetrators have exhibited boldness equal to that of the most renowned villain. Of a few of such instances we may enumerate two recent ones.

During the temporary absence of Judge Este to his meal—his family being gone—some men, in mid-day, entered the garden of his residence and stripped his fruit trees of several baskets of choice fruit, which he had been carefully attending. The officers of justice have been on their track, but have not been able to arrest the culprits.

A few days past, on Fourth street, some cartmen were driving along during the day, when, in the back part of the garden, they spied a fruit tree filled with fruit. They deliberately stopped their carts in front of the house, opened the front gate, proceeded to the tree, and began very leisurely to eat of the fruit. When interrupted by the family, they appeared to consider it a right of their own to eat of the fruit, and Wanton destruction of shrubbery and flowers is so common as to scarcely deserve notice, though very vexatious to those who are bestowing care and thought in their cultivation.

It might be well for such depredators to remember that offences of this character are deemed misdemeanors by the laws of Ohio, and that persons guilty of them are liable to be fined as high as \$500, and to be imprisoned in the county jail for sixty days.

PICTURE OF A SICK SHIP.

The "Union" publishes the following, contained in a letter from an intelligent officer on board the "United States Steamer Mississippi," off the hospital, Pensacola, August 15, 1847:

"Since I wrote by the Potomac a cloud of continued misfortunes has been around us. Sickness, death, and suffering have become too familiar, and the heart almost hardens at the constant scenes of suffering around one, which it has been my lot to witness. After the fire, which, though a great calamity, produced a prodigious triumph, in showing the steady nerve and cool determination of all on board, death has walked amongst us, and disease has been our constant companion. The ship has been sometimes almost deserted, and at others loaded with poor fellows brought to a state of helplessness by the sad inroads of disease. It is a painful sight to see the poor fellows, whose stout arms and manly voices have given so confidence in the fight, fall helpless before us, victims to the pestilence which creeps upon our citizens, more and more than the maintenance of a cheerful mind and a firm adherence to duty where hundreds lie sick around him; but, thank God, the few of us who have been left on board, through all our difficulties, have been able to do so well as to receive the welcome commendations of our general old Commodore. When our ship was first taken to the hospital, great reluctance, but the unequalled decision of the surgeons compelled us to seek some place where our poor fellows could be properly attended to."

THE WAR WITH MEXICO.

In "Brownson's Quarterly Review" for the last month, (July, 1847,) the editor argues that the war with Mexico is "uncalled for, impolitic, and unjust." Mr. BROWNSON is known to wield a powerful pen; he has been for many years considered as no mean champion of Democracy, in support of which he obtained considerable celebrity while editor of the "Democratic Review." He is still the political friend of the President, and an adherent of the party by whom he was elected. It was therefore certainly not to be expected that such a man, in such a position, would undertake to demolish every argument advanced by Mr. Polk and his friends in support of the present war, as Mr. Brownson has done. He has thus voluntarily rendered a service to truth, for which the "Democrats" will never forgive him. But we will allow him to speak for himself:

"For ourselves, we have regarded the Mexican war from the first as uncalled for, impolitic, and unjust. We have examined the official publications of the Government; we have read the official despatches in the last, and we have seen the President's message to Congress, and with every disposition to find our own Government in the right; but we are bound to say that our original impressions have been strengthened rather than weakened. The President undoubtedly makes it clear that we have many just causes of complaint against Mexico, which, at the time of their occurrence, might have justified reprisals, perhaps even war; but the causes, and the justifications of the present war, for they were not the ground on which we professed to engage in it. The official announcement of the President to Congress was that war already existed between the two Republics by the act of Mexico herself; and, whatever use we may make of old grievances to justify the present war, we can make no use of them in defending the war. We can plead in its defense only the fact on which we grounded it—namely, war exists by the act of Mexico herself. But unhappily, at the time of the official announcement, war did not exist between the two Republics at all, for neither Republic had declared war against the other; there had been a collision of their forces, but this was not war, and neither Republic had acknowledged the collision, nor recollected the distinction between war and a collision, nor placing the war on the ground that it existed by the act of Mexico, and that ground being false, he has left it wholly indefensible, whatever old grievances we may have to allege against Mexico."

"The act of Mexico in crossing the Rio Grande, and engaging in an act of hostility, which she had possessed and still claims as hers, but which we asserted had not, is an act, against which she had protested, become ours—the act which the President chose to inform Congress and the world was war—may or may not have been a just cause for declaring war against her, but it assuredly was not war itself. We have no intention to justify Mexico. She may have been deceived in the war, but she may have had no valid title to the territory of which she claims to be the owner, and which she has occupied; that territory may have been rightfully ours, but it may even have been the duty of the President to occupy and defend it; but it cannot be denied that she had once possessed it; that it was still a part of one of her States or Provinces; that she still claimed it, and had continued to exercise jurisdiction over it, and that she had driven it by our army of occupation; that she invaded it by our army, and that she had been called, not as territory belonging to us, but as territory which she had taken; and that she attacked our troops, not for the reason that they were ours, but for the reason, as she held, and she had good right to be judge in her own case as we had in ours, that they were intruders, trespassers on her soil. The motive of the act was not war against the United States, but the expression of her own hostility."

"No sophistry can make her act her own territory. No conceding that our act in taking military possession of that territory was also war, and, if that was war, then the war, it existed at all, existed by our act and not by hers, for her act was consequent upon ours. The most that the President was at liberty to say, without condemning his own Government, was that there had been a collision of the forces of the two Republics on a territory claimed by us, from which we had not withdrawn our troops, and that she had no right to term war, for every body knows that it takes something more than a collision of their respective forces on a disputed territory to constitute a war between two civilized nations. In no possible point of view was the announcement of the President that war existed between the two Republics, as the act of Mexico, correct. It did not exist at all, if it existed, it existed by our act, and not by hers, but by our act. In either case, the official announcement was false, and cannot be defended."

"The President may have been governed by patriotic motives; he may have felt that prompt and energetic action was required; he may have believed that, in great emergencies, a chief magistrate of a powerful Republic, having to deal with a foreign power, should rise superior to mere technical forms, and the niceties of truth and honor, and strikes us that he would have done better, proved himself even more patriotic, and sufficiently prompt and energetic, if he had confined himself to the ordinary rules of morality, and the well-defined principles of international law. By aspiring above these, and to appear original, he has placed his country in a false position, and has exposed himself, whatever the motives, to the charge of having given us, from pleading just causes of war Mexico may have given us, from pleading one of them in justification of the actual war. We must be permitted to regret that he did not reflect beforehand that, if he placed the defence of the war on the ground that it already existed, and existed by the act of Mexico herself, and on that ground demanded of Congress the means of prosecuting the war, he would, in the eyes of the people, be regarded as having failed on his first issue. It is often hazardous in our pleadings to plead what is not true; and in doing so in the present case, the President has not only offended morality, which he may regard as a small matter, but has even committed a blunder."

"The course the President should have pursued is plain and obvious. On learning the state of things on the frontier, the critical condition of our army of occupation, he should have demanded of Congress the reinforcements and supplies necessary to relieve it, and secure the purpose for which it was avowedly sent to the Rio Grande; and, if he believed it proper or necessary to declare war, he should, before Congress a full and truthful statement of our relations with Mexico, including all the unjust complaints, past and present, we had against her, accompanied by the recommendation of a declaration of war. He would then have kept within the limits of his duty, proved himself a plain citizen, a President, and left the responsibility of war or no war to Congress, the only war-making power known to our laws. Congress after most likely would not; the responsibility would have rested with it, and no blame would have been attached to the President."

"Unhappily this course did not occur to the President, or was too plain and simple to meet his approbation. As if he feared, if Congress deliberated, it might refuse to declare war, and as if determined to have war at any rate, he presented to Congress the true issue, whether war should or should not be declared, but the false issue whether Congress would grant him the means of prosecuting a war waged against us by a foreign Power. In the true issue, Congress might have hesitated; in the one actually presented there was no room to hesitate; if the official announcement of the President was to be credited, he had no need to hesitate, he had only to declare that the war already existed, and by the act of Mexico herself, the President relieved Congress of the responsibility of the war, by throwing it all on Mexico. But since he cannot fasten it on Mexico—for he did not already exist, or, if so by our act, and not hers—it necessarily recoils upon himself, and he must bear the responsibility of doing what the Constitution has not authorized him to do, and the intervention of Congress. In effect, therefore, he has trampled the constitution under his feet, set a dangerous precedent, and, by the official publication of a palpable falsehood, sullied the national honor. It is with no pleasure that we speak thus of the Chief Magistrate of the Union, for whose elevation to his high and responsible office we ourselves voted. But what- ever the motives of the President, or the respect we hold to be due from all good citizens to a President, we cannot see the constitution violated and the national honor sacrificed, whether by friend or foe, from good motives or bad, without entering, feeble though it be, our stern and indignant protest."

GEN. SCOTT'S LETTER.—A Western paper calls attention to the fact that the letter purporting to be from Gen. Scott to the Hon. M. FILLMORE, upon the subject of the discharge of a soldier who had imbibed conscientious scruples against performing military duty, is not dated.

This would cast reasonable suspicion on the letter, but such suspicion is needless. We learned on Sunday evening that Mr. Fillmore had received no such letter. We only regret that a man capable of conceiving so excellent a letter should have been capable of playing off such a pitiful hoax; the motive for so doing is certainly not very apparent.

[Columbian Enquirer.]

THE WAGON MAN HUNG.—A young printer named Boyington, who spent his time in the New York Herald office, was hung a few years since in Alabama, upon a charge of having murdered a companion, with whom he was travelling. He protested his innocence to the last, but without avail. Recently the landlady in whose house the murder was committed confessed the crime on his death bed! Boyington was a young man of fine talents and prepossessing appearance, whose guilt was doubtful, and whose death was a great loss to the community. The fact that he was the last person to see with the murdered man, is a fact which is not mentioned in the account.

[Albany Journal.]

ADOPTION OF THE VIRGINIA LAW BY THE BALTIMORE AND OHIO RAILROAD COMPANY.

The Stockholders of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, at a general meeting held on Wednesday, accepted the late law of the Legislature of Virginia, authorizing the construction of the road through that State to the Ohio river, on condition that Wheeling be made the terminus of the road. The following are the proceedings of the Stockholders, as condensed from the Baltimore American of yesterday:

In pursuance of public notice, a meeting of the Stockholders of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company was held at the company's office yesterday morning, at 10 o'clock. At the appointed hour, on motion of SAMUEL HOFFMAN, Esq., the meeting was organized by appointing EDWARD D. KEMP, Esq., Chairman, and HENRY HARDISTY, Jr., Secretary. The Chairman then announced that about 52,873 shares of stock were represented, which constituted a quorum.

LOUIS MCCLANE, Esq., the President of the Company, rose and stated that the object of the meeting was to consider the expediency of accepting the act of the Virginia Legislature, which grants the right of way to the company to Wheeling. He then submitted the report of the committee appointed at a previous meeting of the Board of Directors to visit Wheeling and report the results of their investigations to the stockholders.

JOHN T. FLYNN, Esq., stated that, inasmuch as a majority of the directors of the company were not present, and the interest of the State, which amounted to \$4,500,000, would be unrepresented, he would move an adjournment until Thursday morning, at 10 o'clock.

MICHAEL C. SPRING, Esq., one of the State agents present, then read a letter from his colleague, Col. FILLMORE, stating that it would be impossible for him to reach Baltimore before two o'clock in the afternoon. In order that the vote of the State might be given on the important question to be brought before the meeting, Mr. Spring urged the adjournment. (The other State agent present was A. B. DAVIS, Esq.)

WESLEY STARR, Esq., one of the directors on the part of the city, objected to the adjournment on the ground that his engagements would prevent him from being present at the adjourned meeting, and stated that he did not think the eight directors were present, some casualty might occur by which the city direction would be left in a minority, and the vote on the part of the city would not be cast.

Mr. Starr's views were sustained by T. PARKIN SCOTT, Esq., one of the city directors, and by Mr. MCCLANE, the President of the Company.

After considerable discussion an adjournment took place until 4 o'clock in the afternoon, which, it was alleged, would allow sufficient time for Mr. Tighman, the absent State agent, to arrive; and at the time appointed the meeting reassembled.

When it was called to order—

SAMUEL HOFFMAN, Esq., stated that Mr. MCCLANE, the President of the Company, had prepared a statement of his views in relation to the question about to come before the meeting, and that he had read it to the meeting, and that he had signed reading it, but that should after the morning adjournment he was taken ill, and was then under medical attendance. Mr. Hoffman asked that the statement of Mr. MCCLANE might be made a part of the record of the proceedings of the meeting. This created some discussion, which was terminated by Mr. Hoffman withdrawing the papers.

PARKIN SCOTT, Esq., then offered several resolutions accepting the Virginia law, and authorizing the President and Directors of the Company to proceed as early as practicable to the construction of the road to that point. A division of the question being called for, the resolutions accepting the law were passed almost unanimously.

Gen. FLYNN, on the part of the State of Maryland, then introduced a resolution to the resolution authorizing the early construction of the road, and resolved that the company shall not be obliged to go west of Cumberland until it was ascertained that the means for the completion of the road to Wheeling had been raised; and also a resolution directing the appointment of a committee of five, to be composed of persons not members of the Board, or officers of the company, who should be charged with the duty of examining the interests of the stockholders, and of ascertaining the amount of their stock, whose duty it shall be to examine with the chief engineer the different routes proposed towards the terminus of the road, and to report the result of such examination to a future meeting of the stockholders.

The introduction of this substitute created a long discussion, which was participated in by Gen. Tighman and Mr. Glenn, who supported the Virginia law, and Messrs. Swanwick, McKaig, of Cumberland, Richard Lemmon, and John Nelson, who opposed it. The substitute was rejected.

The resolution offered by Mr. Scott was then adopted. THOS. SWANICK, Esq., submitted a resolution requesting the President of the Company to furnish a copy of the remarks he had read from reading for publication among the proceedings of the meeting. The resolution was agreed to, and, about nine o'clock, the meeting adjourned sine die.

A FAIR HIT.

The New Orleans National has not done more than justice, in the following imaginary correspondence, to the practice of writing letters to eminent public men, propounding all manner of unmeaning questions, and then publishing their answers. It would seem as if every scribbler in the land had been catechizing GEN. TAYLOR, and that he, a frank old soldier, answers them as if it were an official duty. The questions propounded in the following imaginary correspondence by Mr. Snooks are not less important than many that have been propounded to the General.

"HONI SOIT QUI MAL Y PENSE."

HIGHLY IMPORTANT CORRESPONDENCE.

PROSPECTIVEVILLE, JUNE 7, 1847.

DEAR SIR: As you are our candidate for the Presidency, so constituted by the people, you are, therefore, open to all sorts of pertinent questions. Your privacy to be invaded and you are to suffer yourself to be daily examined, as if you were a simple witness in the hands of an indefinite number of sharp lawyers, and as if you were a simple witness, and being an exceedingly small specimen of the human race, and, being years past, for the sake of notoriety, to endeavor to fasten myself on the tail of some great man, who happened, for the time, to be in the ascendancy.

I am opposed to your elevation to any office, and would not vote for you were you, in the language of a late Locofoco Statesman, "pure enough to sit on the right hand of the Throne of Heaven." Yet I would be exceedingly delighted if you would answer the questions I put to you in this letter, not only for the purpose of having them published against you, if they can be so used, in case you are a candidate, but also for the sake of getting my name before the people, as having done something to assist in misrepresenting your real services. If I accomplish this, and you are defeated, I am sure of some small office as a reward for my ingenious services.

I wish to know, firstly, whether you are in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or do you believe in the modern system invented by Bob Walker, who used a large stone in one end to balance the grain in the other? Secondly, are you in favor of mules having colts? Thirdly, are you in favor of crossing the nutmeg melon with the pumpkin? And, fourthly, are you in favor of putting corn in both ends of a bag that is sent to mill on horseback, or